

Governing through Filipino migrant communities: citizenship, self-governance and social entrepreneurship

Mosuela, Cleovi

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Arbeitspapier / working paper

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Mosuela, C. (2018). *Governing through Filipino migrant communities: citizenship, self-governance and social entrepreneurship*. (COMCAD Working Papers, 159). Bielefeld: Universität Bielefeld, Fak. für Soziologie, Centre on Migration, Citizenship and Development (COMCAD). <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-56163-8>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mosuela, Cleovi*

Governing through Filipino migrant communities:

Citizenship, self-governance and social entrepreneurship

COMCAD Arbeitspapiere - Working Papers

No. 159, 2018

Mosuela, Cleovi: Governing through Filipino migrant communities. Bielefeld: COMCAD, 2018 (Working Papers – Centre on Migration, Citizenship and Development; 159)

The COMCAD Working Paper Series is intended to aid the rapid distribution of work in progress, research findings and special lectures by researchers and associates of COMCAD. Papers aim to stimulate discussion among the worldwide community of scholars, policymakers and practitioners. They are distributed free of charge in PDF format via the COMCAD website.

The opinions expressed in the papers are solely those of the author/s who retain the copyright. Comments on individual Working Papers are welcomed, and should be directed to the author/s.

Bielefeld University
Faculty of Sociology
Centre on Migration, Citizenship and Development (COMCAD)
Postfach 100131
D-33501 Bielefeld
Homepage: http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/ag_comcad/

Abstract

The paper sets out to understand the emergence of a particular alignment within the context of contemporary governance of cross-border mobility. The first element comprises of overseas Filipino workers claiming that their altruistic actions, in the form of social entrepreneurial activities and investments in the Philippines, can help counter the growing social costs and the culture of overseas work, wherein Filipino youth are at risk of continuing the same kind of situation as their migrant parents; and the second, mobile and transnationally connected Philippine non-government organizations (NGOs) translating their expertise on migration and development through strategies such as community empowerment and risk management. Quite a number of NGOs reach out to OFWs and inject social entrepreneurship and financial literacy programs articulating socioeconomic rights to OFWs beyond their precarious work, and are designed to harness the potentials of cross-border migration and development in the Philippines. The specific cases of domestic workers in Italy turning into social investors and entrepreneurs signify the emergence of active citizenship coupled with cultural norms and values – a novel articulation of citizenship within spaces of migrant associations or “community.”¹

Keywords: cross-border labor migration and development, overseas Filipino workers, citizenship, governance, social entrepreneurship

¹ This working paper is a rework of my MA thesis submitted to Central European University Budapest, Hungary.

Table of Contents

Abstract	3
Table of Contents	4
1. Introduction	5
2. Migrants as Agents of Development	8
3. The Ethos of Social Entrepreneurship	9
4. Citizenship and Community	11
5. Re-purposing Cross-border Migrants.....	13
5.1 Community Empowerment Techniques.....	15
5.2 Risk Management Techniques.....	16
5.3 Active Citizenship: “Proper” Relationships between Community and Citizenship	18
6. Modern-day Heroes’ Re-articulation of Citizenship	20
6.1 Empowering oneself	21
6.2 Capitalizing on strategic skills	23
7. Concluding thoughts.....	25
References	27

1. Introduction

Tala², a Filipina migrant worker in Rome, proudly says, “I consider myself a hero and a leader of my family because I do not neglect them. I have never thought of giving up on them. My children are very thankful because they wouldn’t be able to survive without me being here especially because I send an average of 500 Euros a month without a miss and they go to good schools. However, I would like them to understand that I am alone working for the family, being the breadwinner.” Aside from domestic work, Tala has ventured into developing a social entrepreneurship activity, AKIT Magazine, along with ten other overseas Filipino workers (OFWs) who have also undergone a social entrepreneurship program. She says the magazine is an avenue for the Filipino youth to write original columns and hopefully inspire OFWs, particularly the youth, to spend their time in something worthwhile and make use of their talents. In this way, it aims to address the social problems of Filipino youth in Italy through changing their mindset to focusing on studying so as not to end up doing domestic work, just like their experience. Some of the social problems she identifies are difficulty in adjusting to the Italian environment, especially in speaking the language and in school where they experience bullying and peer pressure. Because parents are busy earning Euros, children are not guided well with Filipino values and they tend to follow what they see from other Italian youth, according to Tala. As she always imparts to her three children in the Philippines, “do not waste time, study while you are young.” Her role in this venture is to sell the magazine, for only 1 Euro per copy, and so far they have had six publications since 2010.

The paper sets out to understand the emergence of a particular alignment within the context of contemporary governance of cross-border mobility. The first element comprises of overseas Filipino workers (OFWs) claiming that their altruistic actions, in the form of social entrepreneurial activities and investments in the Philippines, can help counter the growing social costs and the culture of overseas work, wherein Filipino youth are at risk of continuing the same kind of situation as their migrant parents; and second, mobile and transnationally connected Philippine non-government organizations (NGOs) translating their expertise on migration and development through strategies such as community empowerment and risk man-

² Names of interview participants and program of social entrepreneurship and financial literacy have been altered/anonymized.

agement. Quite a number of NGOs reach out to OFWs (whether in Asia or Europe) and inject social entrepreneurship and financial literacy programs articulating socioeconomic rights to OFWs beyond their precarious work, and are designed to harness the potentials of cross-border migration and development in the Philippines. Such NGOs encourage OFWs to shift their attention away from the conditions of their contingent work to the prospects of local resources and market dynamism thereby realizing socio-economic change.

Its emergence warrants critical examination because the discourse on cross-border migration is framed within animated concerns of economic development, only if OFWs can sustain remittance transactions and recognize that as one “Filipino migrant community” they can optimize their inherent potential. The discussion contributes to contemporary academic debates on transnationalism, immigration, and citizenship, which have mostly overlooked migrants’ perspectives on citizenship (Leitner and Ehrkamp 2006). Tala is an apt contemporary emblem of a “Filipino modern-day hero” as she embodies novel strategies – with elements of community, responsibility and flexibility – not only in enhancing her standard of living but also in realigning her values and visions with the interests of economic development induced by cross-border labor migration. Filipino domestic workers in Rome – with the first influx in the 1970s (Basa, Harcourt, Zarro 2011: 13) – provide a case in point in relation to mobilizing themselves for collective action to contribute to social development projects in the Philippines, as they attempt to showcase how financial remittances ought to be used productively. The specific cases of transnational social investors and entrepreneurs and households, which I will put forth, signify the emergence of active citizenship coupled with cultural norms and values as novel articulations of citizenship within community spaces, which become a standard of political subjectivity against which all other members are measured.

I pursued a methodological investigation of transnational connections through multi-sited fieldwork, which allows me to take into account a greater variety of societal forms (Faist 2010). I was able to analytically explore transnational processes of transactional flows to and from migrants and households in Rome and Metro Manila (between January and March 2013) and what community-led development strategies mean on the ground. I moved via sojourns in mainly two spatially dispersed fields. It entailed the situational combination of various field techniques such as semi-structured interviews with Filipino workers and household members undergoing social entrepreneurship and financial literacy training session, with development practitioners and trainers; and observation of training sessions. Thus, this methodology renders itself useful given that migrants are often entrenched in multifaceted, multi-sited transnational social fields, including the movers and the non-movers (Levitt, Glick Schiller 2004: 1003).

The case of Rome hosting OFWs is illustrative of a pivotal terrain, where particular arrangements of governance have materialized in terms of the emergence of social entrepreneurial activities as an innovative development approach through NGOs on the one hand and transformations in the institutionalized relations between the state and its “members” on the other. More significantly, what is present in the field is the emergence of migrant community as the new site of citizenship and subject of governance, which regards the capacities of individuals as members of a population, as resources to be cultivated, and at the same time regards itself as self-governing. This exemplar is important for us to rethink the rights and responsibilities that such actors and institutions assign to transnational belonging.

I suggest looking at the phenomenon through the lens of “governing through community” which regards community as not only a site of governance or an object of governance and a goal but also at the same time the subject of governance or self-governance (Rose 1999). With that I argue that the Filipino migrant communities today have become a key site for, as well as constitutive of, new citizenship articulations of self-governing and social entrepreneurship.

The discussion proceeds as follows. The first three parts look at the literature on migrants and development and social entrepreneurship and their relation to “governing through community.” The call for unpacking the literature becomes apparent when we consider the extent to which discourse on cross-border migrant communities exhibits their potentialities for sustaining economic development, mainly because of financial remittances; and the concept of social entrepreneurship heavily rests on several buzzwords – empowerment, social change, local, and community – each of which has been defined broadly and rather uncritically without considering the broader processes they are embedded in and their implications for citizenship. Explaining the usage of the concept “governing through community” follows. The next section traces the emergence of social entrepreneurship and financial literacy programs through the expert role of Philippine NGOs seeking to manage “self-governing,” “empowered” and “responsible” citizen-subjects that are valuable to achieving economic development. It reveals that entrepreneurializing the everyday lives of OFWs is attached to new citizenship ideals. It is followed by a discussion of the ways in which governance practices are internalized by OFWs, create subjectivities and articulate understandings of citizenship.

2. Migrants as Agents of Development

Since post World War II, migrants have been viewed as direct bearers of developmental goals because they are able to reach places, which other development machinery has limited access to (Raghuram 2007: 5). Migrants' role in redistributing wealth has indicated that they have been recognized as the contemporary agents of development (ibid). In particular, migrant associations have been rendered as significant agents. Agents such as "hometown associations, networks of businesspersons, epistemic networks and political diasporas are portrayed as unitary collective actors" (Faist 2008: 22).

In light of this recognition, Faist (2010) reasonably contends that the conceptualization of a transnational civil society coincides with the significance given to community or civil society as a pillar of development in the last thirty years. The author states that the drift toward marketization overlapped with the notion that development involved the empowerment of both individuals and communities to take on the project of development. Since the state retreated as a technique for establishing social order, the community, with an accent on local autonomy and grassroots involvement, materialized as a compensating apparatus and a functional corrective to previous top-down development approaches (ibid).

By the end of the century, international development policy agencies, through 'third-way politics,' positioned the community as a third force balancing both market and state (Taylor 2003). Faist (2008, 2010) expounds how these associations started to use a new concept called social capital, which is assumed to propel development. The author expresses that resources, such as reciprocity and solidarity, which are intrinsic in social ties, are understood as capital-yielding interest. Bringing back the community to the development discourse has also been considered in the migration-development nexus through recognizing the leading role of cross-border migrants and communities, especially their increasing remittances (ibid). The author articulates that the state has assumed the role of a service provider for the market and the community in granting them the essential infrastructure for economic development. He illustrates that this function can be found in Spain and France vis-a-vis West African states, in which migrants are believed to alleviate poverty especially if local governments work with them. This idea is termed co-development, whereby migrants are persuaded to return to their countries and are given financial packages to found businesses on their return (ibid).

In a particular study of the agency of transnational communities in the context of development, Caglar (2006) correctly asserts that hometown associations (HTAs) take the lead to operate, to a greater extent, as local development agencies for governments and multi- and supra-national organizations. This process can be explained by the rescaling of political and economic space in the framework of the neoliberalization of the state's regulatory activities. The author argues that within this agenda of evolving neoliberal market-oriented redistributive schemes, state intervention via HTAs are intended to de-center nationally-scaled forms of state actions. Programs of sending states such as channeling migrants' remittances to development strategies can be accounted for from this framework (ibid).

3. The Ethos of Social Entrepreneurship

The origin of the expression 'social entrepreneurship' (SE) is vague, and yet the concept has been taken up to be a powerful vehicle for social change. Until the late 1990s social entrepreneurship was at first a subject of interest for practitioners who saw themselves as civic entrepreneurs working in shared arenas to enhance the resilience of specific communities or to bring about systemic change within a wide array of social and financial services, according to Hulgard (2010: 295). The author states that since the turn of the century, this picture has changed. Almost 75 percent of academic articles published on social entrepreneurship have surged in the first years of the 2000s, which demonstrates the novelty and increasing significance of the issues related to the concept (ibid).

Current definitions of SE do not represent a single body of ideas, however they establish four common identifiable themes: social value creation; a specific understanding of civil society, which demonstrates the need to differentiate from corporate social responsibility (CSR) in the private commercial sector; innovation in relation to addressing social issues; and economic activity (Hulgard 2010; Farmer, Hill, Muñoz 2012). The last three elements are rather contested. Briefly, CSR is defined as conditions where the established firm incorporates activities that advance some social benefit which is in compliance with the law (McWilliams, Siegel, Wright 2006). In this regard, SE sidesteps CSR through its operation in a different setting, wherein its vision materializes in novel organizational forms rather than existing corporations. However, social enterprises can still incorporate and even advance CSR principles (Page, Katz 2011). In terms of innovation, this element highlights SE cultivating a new approach to a social problem and not only the desire to build an enterprise. On the other hand,

SE activities generally have an economic impact either on the participating communities or on the enterprise itself (Hulgard 2010).

At this point, it is important to note that the current literature leaves critical questions unanswered: what comprises social value? What kind of civil society does SE want to build? Is SE a sign that private commercial actors are becoming more interested in the sphere of civil society as a way of enhancing market penetration at the grassroots level? How does a social entrepreneur balance resource allocations between welfare-providing endeavors and profit-making?

To understand how social entrepreneurship has emerged as a tool of development, the literature provides historical phases into which the concept has been entrenched. Social entrepreneurship is embedded in two major, yet diverse, trends that have had a remarkable impact on policy-making around the globe since the mid-1980s (Hulgard 2010: 298). The first is the marketization and the privatization of responsibility for public welfare and the shaking-up of social services with a neoliberal weave (ibid). SE has been highly associated with the decline of the welfare system in advanced liberal societies (Dey 2010: 7). It was a historical period where the weaknesses and failures of late capitalism shook up Western principles of social equality, freedom and justice (ibid). According to Hulgard (2010: 299), the second movement is rooted in the global financial crisis in 2008, which paved the way for *économie solidaire* (solidarity economy) as a substitute for the shareholder-based private economy. This trend is characterized by experimentation with new modes of solidarity, collectivism and social activism by civil society groups and social movements making its way into the realm of high politics (ibid). As a reaction against neoliberalism, the concept of social entrepreneurship has been advanced as the solution to welfare problems caused by social change and the constant rate of unemployment (Cook, Dodds, Mitchell 2003: 57). To a certain extent, SE has become an important denomination for many attempts to bring together economic and 'non-economic' methods to the provision of public and private goods (Hart, Laville, Cattani 2010). In relation to this, Third Way writers, such as Giddens (1998), advocate social entrepreneurship as an approach to restructure welfare and implicate building social affiliations among the public, social and business sectors and making the most of market dynamism with the pursuit of public goals (Dey 2010; Cook, Dodds, Mitchell 2003). Thus, taking the two movements together, social entrepreneurship reproduces both the marketization and civil society trends as a new approach to respond to social problems in contemporary society.

The other side of the coin is that social entrepreneurship does not go against neoliberalism, rather it is one of its theoretical creations (Dey 2010: 9). Dey justly observes that SE gets situated as a government technique wherein the state is no longer understood as being re-

sponsible for the construction and protection of societal stability. Rather, the state presumes the normalization of the entrepreneur character of one's self and the imperative that individuals must enhance their own bodies as an agency of social value foundation (ibid: 2). The author argues that neoliberalism constitutes the state in ways that it induces the expansion of political forms of government to forms of self-regulation, through strategies striving to change the conduct of individuals through themselves. The author reasonably contends that the fundamental hoax of neoliberalism is that it envisages both the reason of and the answer to adversities in connection with the individual or the community. Hence, the foremost undertaking of government is to cultivate vigorous social entrepreneurs, encouraging them as both just and desirable, and tailoring them to the desires of the market, rather than the other way around (Dey 2010). Peredo (2009 in Dey 2010: 7) provides a case in point that the role of social entrepreneurs then has been defined in relation to the flight of government-led, publicly supported welfare systems, intertwined with a trend to transfer responsibility to private agents within civil society.

To conclude, social entrepreneurship is an endeavor and a phenomenon that underscores the tension between the development of solidarity approaches to markets and politics and the reinforcement of neoliberal ideologies. Social entrepreneurship carries a celebratory representation of individuals with social responsibilities and simultaneously participating in capital-generating activities and a representation of autonomous and empowered communities.

3. Citizenship and Community

"Governing through community" (Rose 1999: 189) makes a powerful concept in the analysis of the emergence of cross-border migrant communities as citizen-subjects, precisely because community appears as an established part of government. In his influential book *Powers of Freedom*, Rose (1999) presents a valid claim that the state absolves itself in responding to societal needs and so facilitates individuals and organizations to undertake a part of the responsibility for solving social problems. The author elucidates the paradox of governing wherein organizations that were once entangled in the bureaucratic force of the social state are set free to discover their own fate, however, they are made responsible for their actions. Rose calls this process "a double movement of autonomization and responsabilization" (p.174). He builds on the idea that the neoliberal form of government enables the powers of the citizens, who are "to be located in a nexus of ties and affinities that were not those of the social, but appeared to have a more powerful, and yet more natural, existence: community"

(p.166). Thus, community “becomes governmental when it is made technical” (ibid: 175). The author contends that politics is to be given back to society in a form of community characterized by moral individuals, responsible organizations and ethical community.

In a similar vein, Li (2006) argues that community becomes a way of making collective existence “intelligible and calculable” (p.4). Li points out the enigma that lies at the heart of government through community: community radiates natural characteristics (possessing the ‘good, sustainable, democratic life’), however it still needs expert attention to help achieve its own development. Precisely, this paradox of community makes it an ideal site for governmental intervention, which gives experts work to do (Li 2006).

Take community-led development strategies as an example. In this sense, a new network of relations of institutions and actors stretching outside the limits of formal state authorities play an increasingly important role in assuring that communities possess the power to effectively take charge of their own development. Therefore, communities must entangle themselves in a set of connections that will sustain them in order to govern themselves responsibly (Herbert-Cheshire and Higgins 2004). Swyngedouw (2005) refers to these connections as socially innovative institutional or quasi-institutional arrangements of governance that are organized in seemingly horizontal ensembles, as associational networks of private, civil society (usually NGOs), and state actors. They function at various interconnected scales, from the local/urban level to the transnational scale (ibid).

Raghuram (2007) efficiently relates this sense of commitment to a community to the migration-development nexus, wherein neoliberal subjectivity is activated through the migrants’ bodies. She contends that this network depends on and thus fosters the moral sentiment that is a sense of obligation to a collective - those who can be developed elsewhere. Thus, the new citizen-subject or the mobile governable subject of the nexus is responsabilized to move so as to strategize their human capital and also to act morally for the collective good of a distant place/community (Raghuram 2007: 16). The author claims that these migrants make the sacrifices needed to amend the consequences of years of development disasters. It is a sacrifice because this particular formulation of migration and development loses sight of the everyday nature of individual betterment that is not caught up in redistribution (Raghuram 2007).

4. Re-purposing Cross-border Migrants

Long before the International Organization for Migration launched their campaign “Migrant Heroes”³ in 2015, OFWs and migrant associations have already been constituted by the Philippine state as modern-day heroes due to their significant contribution to the economy through their regular provision of monetary remittances. The state has been attributing various heroic names: citizens of the world by Dante Ang, former chair of the Commission of Filipinos Overseas, economic savior by the Estrada administration, and overseas Filipino investors by the Arroyo administration, new aristocrats and the new ambassadors of goodwill (Weekley 2003: 4). OFWs, used to be called overseas contract workers, are Filipinos employed in a foreign country for the duration of their work contract or until retirement. Part of a large scale labor export regime that has given rise to approximately 25 percent of the labor force working abroad (Lindley 2009; Solomon 2009), working overseas has been considered a lucrative alternative to domestic labor market since the 1970s. Yet, there are reported social costs of cross-border migration resulting from the lack of savings consciousness of migrants (and their household), which then breeds dependency on the earnings of household members, disinterest in education and non-setting of goals (field notes 2013).

The production of new knowledge about the potentiality of migrant workers to bring about economic local development and the emergence of new actors, such as Philippine non-government organizations engaged in the discourse, are a mutually constitutive process. Mechanisms of the cross-border migration bureaucracy, such as the Philippine Overseas Employment Agency (POEA), the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA), the Commission of Filipinos Overseas (CFO), the Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA), and the National Reintegration Center for OFWs find their roles to shape the nature of the scope of global labor markets for citizens. Similarly, various international organizations and NGOs in both the Philippines and the host country have been pioneering in courting Filipino migrant workers to utilize their remittances for local development. NGOs⁴ have been devising programs (i.e. social entrepreneurship and financial literacy) aimed to “empower” OFWs and families, which allow them to contribute to the economic development of the Philippines.

³ <http://www.iamanimmigrant.net/migrant-heroes>

⁴ Three of which have been consulted for this research.

These organizations have been gaining traction by positioning themselves as mobile. They draw connections with migrant workers, hometown associations and international organizations involved in migration issues and work hand in hand with government agencies established in the governance of cross-border labor migration. Specifically, these NGOs claim that migrant households and communities are “disempowered” due to their illiteracy in managing remittances and savings. Thus, being disempowered will hinder these communities from taking charge of their own development, making them at risk of not realizing their innate qualities and possibilities to mobilize as agents of development. Consequently, these NGOs assert themselves as experts in empowering these households/communities at risk and in tapping their resources to contribute to development. Through community participation and the use of inducements (i.e. heroic names, the promise of better economic life), these NGOs promote empowerment, responsibility, competition and choice.

The expertise of NGOs is fundamentally about managing the risk and security of the cross-border migrant population by granting them value. As they sort out various categories of the population, NGOs assert claims on their behalf and provide them with resources that may be translatable into entitlements and rights, once associated with all citizens (Ong 2005: 697).

The term expert is a broad one, but this paper focuses specifically on development and culture experts who promote social entrepreneurship and active citizenship as a way of addressing societal problems and achieving change in cross-border migrants at risk. This type of expertise forms the discursive and technical conditions wherein communities are able to ‘know’ themselves, recognize the challenges they face, and take the appropriate steps to guarantee sustainable long-term development (Herbert-Cheshire and Higgins 2004: 290). These experts are a constitutive part of community-led development strategies and what Rose (1999) calls “governing through community” (p.189). The community must be “investigated, mapped, classified, documented, interpreted” (Rose 1999: 175). It takes expert knowledge to uncover the features of a community through particular techniques (Li 2006: 6). In this section, I reveal the pivotal role of such expertise in identifying, governing, and determining limits on the capacities of migrants and households to transform themselves into active agents in their self-governance. As Rose (1996) spells out, in making communities visible, experts provide guidance and technical resources in empowering individuals “to conduct themselves within particular cultural communities of ethics and lifestyle according to certain specified arts of active personal responsibility” (p.348). Moreover, I indicate that a significant consequence of expert knowledge is the construction of categories of risk in which those households/communities that choose to align with the imposed course of development are

depicted as ‘active’ and responsible, while those who do not are marginalized and labeled as risky and irresponsible (Herbert-Cheshire and Higgins 2004: 290).

5.1 Community Empowerment Techniques

How much money do I send? How are my remittances being spent? It's our right to know. If you want to reach your financial goal, you should be honest with your family. These are some of the whole plethora of concerns OFWs need to contemplate on and eventually respond to upon undertaking the course of empowerment. Dean (2010: 82) states that since the 1960s the notion of empowering the disenfranchised, the victims of social inequalities and discrimination, economic deprivation and political subordination has urged reformers in liberal-democratic states to enable all citizens to participate in decision-making processes and to stress autonomy and self-determination. Empowerment suggests that human beings are latent agents and they must be empowered to become so or to actively participate in the transformation of their situation (Dean 2010). Empowerment programs are clear illustrations of neoliberal rationalities of government that attempt to operationalize the self-governing capacities of the governed in the quest for governmental pursuits (ibid).

Techniques of empowerment are applied to OFWs and families who are problematized as “disempowered,” “victims,” or “dependent,” with low morale and self-esteem. “OFWs mind-set is to work as an employee” (Expert 1 interview). In addition, “OFWs find it difficult to understand that their money won’t sleep if it’s kept in the bank” (Expert 2 interview). These labels and characterizations, adding to the knowledge of expertise, become critical in empowering migrants and households to manage their lives and embracing a prudent and calculative approach to self-governance. SE Program 1 “provides opportunities for empowerment. It contributes to the reintegration program which can prepare OFWs when they go back home. The goal is for OFWs and families to empower themselves” (Expert 1 interview), specifically their “economic empowerment” (Expert 3 interview).

Equipped with techniques that promise improved financial management and economic fortunes and a better lifestyle, this expert knowledge seeking to achieve change in a neoliberal way acts as a key center of calculation (Miller and Rose 2008) in making ‘community’ visible, and in constituting the discursive structure in which households can ponder on their conduct and convert themselves into active agents in their self-governance (Herbert-Cheshire and Higgins 2004: 290). The conversion to become a change-maker in the household or beyond starts with self-reflection. The list of Filipino core values functions as a checklist of how one

measures up to the ideal strengths and at the same time how one surpasses the weaknesses. In this context, technologies of self-reflection and self-management (Rose 1998: 156-160) aim to “question one’s attitude” and eventually “build new habits and bring about behavioral change” (Expert 1 interview). To become active agents of self-governance, the development scheme imparts to the OFWs a whole gamut of new responsibilities, such as “continue to learn livelihood opportunities, discover one’s self, get new skills that can get them advanced, to grow, improve themselves, change their mindset” (ibid). OFWs must always align their actions with the goals identified by the development scheme: “to become leaders of ourselves and of our family, to move beyond one’s challenges to be able to help improve the situation of other people, to contribute to positive change and nation-building” (ibid). Through financial literacy, OFWs are taught “how to handle money, especially for enjoyment and consumption, to think ahead and be able to invest, prepare for the future, meet financial goals, and harness their resources. [Also, these techniques mean] doing something for the community” (ibid). Along the same line of thought, ERCOF, through their financial literacy programs, convinces people to start opening an account and manage their remittances and finances via the formal banking channels. In this sense, the management of financial insecurity has become a potentially lucrative activity. By recasting OFWs as “social entrepreneurs” and “change-makers,” NGOs provide fertile ground for techniques of empowerment, charting a discourse of national responsibility and financial independence onto the bodies of newly enterprising individuals.

As Miller and Rose (2008) argue, “empowerment, then, is a matter of experts teaching, coaxing, requiring their clients to conduct themselves within particular cultural communities of ethics and lifestyle, according to certain specified arts of active personal responsibility” (p.106). Through the lens of governmentality, this expertise entails knowledge of the powerlessness of migrants and households, and of the process for inducing the powerless to view themselves as members of a community and take part in community-led development programs.

5.2 Risk Management Techniques

NGOs and SE schemes target OFWs and households as their intended beneficiaries. Several factors drive this: from the realization that migrant workers are risk-takers as exemplified by their leaving the country to the representation of households being dependent on remittances as a source of income and the household at risk of impoverishment due to mishandling finances. The notion of risk in this discourse can be understood through the lens of

governmentality, in which particular forms of conduct are thought as risky as a result of being rendered visible by means of representation and calculation. As Dean (1999) argues, risk “is a way of representing events in a certain form so they might be made governable in particular ways, with particular techniques and for particular goals” (p.177). Moreover, governing functions through community to produce and order risk, which means communities are effectively rendered as key sources of risk (Herbert-Cheshire and Higgins 2004).

In this regard, Miller and Rose (2008) elucidate the notion of risk as a valuable entry point into the altered relations of expertise and community. The facility for power, or the lack of it, which is the key object of expertise is re-thought concerning the relations of risk and community Miller and Rose (2008): the risks posed to the individuals themselves if they are not able to govern their life within the community and the risks the individual might pose to the community in consequence of their failure to manage themselves. From this perspective, all cross-border migrant communities are in effect ‘at risk,’ but those who opt to take steps to ‘accurately’ diagnose this risk through expertise are most likely to be esteemed as having the capacities for effective self-governance and eventually effecting social change. On the contrary, failure to handle risk is regarded as a problem in developing innovative and entrepreneurial solutions to local decline and in aligning with the demands of a global economy. In the same way as Dean (1999) reasons, risk “can be minimized, localized and avoided, but never dissipated” (p. 167).

The significance of NGOs as experts of cross-border migrant community is illustrated most clearly by the generated list of Filipino core values divided into strengths and weaknesses. They serve as checklists to identify what it means to be an entrepreneur and an agent of change. They are provided by development experts as a way of supporting migrant communities in measuring if they are performing up to par, and in finding out whether corrective measures to augment that performance are necessary. The mere construction of the checklists is a type of governmental technique that attempts to constitute, embody and shape community and risk in a neoliberal way. First, they serve as technical means of problematizing the conduct of cross-border migrants and households and rendering their ‘deviations’ visible. As OFWs and households manage their own risks in a responsible way, it is essential that they subject themselves to technologies of self-examination and self-reflection (Rose 1998: 156-160) so as to ‘know’ themselves, the risks they face and their capacity to manage those risks aptly. Alex (Expert 4 interview) elucidates their expert role in governing the process a migrant has to go through in becoming an agent of change.

We intend to impart leadership, planning, communication (including negotiation and conflict management) skills with the participants. The financial literacy modules provide practical exercises and insights on how participants can plot, work towards and

achieve their financial goals. This involves thorough understanding of the reasons why they left the country to begin with. It forces them to examine how they have managed their resources since they got here. It allows them to look into their remittance practices – a crucial component in reaching financial goals. During this stage, we invite them to dialogue with their families to share their financial goals and how this will eventually affect their remittance behavior.

This entire process requires a shift in mentality and the courage to confront deeply rooted cultural issues. We hope that this course equips them with the right mindset and attitude to deal with the hard choices that come with financial literacy. They have to decide what they want for their future, the sacrifices and initiatives that need to be made to achieve those, and how to handle relationships that are affected along the way. We expect them to become more independent thinkers, to be more resolute and disciplined in pursuing their goals, once they learn these skills.

Second, NGOs subject OFWs to the norms of conduct that are deemed to exemplify responsible leaders, entrepreneurs and change-makers. They also ease the process wherein subjects act upon and convert themselves in accordance to these norms, through the provision of training. In general, the stress given on training is closely associated with the advancement of what has been referred to as “active citizenship” (Dean 1995; Rose 1999).

5.3 Active Citizenship: “Proper” Relationships between Community and Citizenship

The connection between community and citizenship is rather complex precisely because the responsabilization of citizens takes place under the guise of obligation and community and the shifting responsibility for well-being away from the state (Staeheli 2008: 8). As Rose (1999) claims, “[community] is a moral field binding persons into durable relations. It is a space of emotional relationships through which individual identities are constructed through their bonds to micro-cultures of values and meanings” (p.172). Citizenship, then, is now realized in this moral space and not in relation with the state.

Building and empowering the cross-border migrant community serve as a strategy for entering the public arena as citizens. “Migrants’ rights are advanced through basic financial and cultural education. Their right to information is promoted through the provision of tools and helpful insights and practical suggestions from the resource persons” (Expert 4 interview). In the same vein, “financial literacy is related to socio-economic rights. The greater the knowledge, the greater the ability of the public to develop a culture of resource management. As a consequence, the greater ability to provide their children the right to education, even awareness on how to enforce other rights, and hopefully obligations” (Expert 2 interview).

In other words, these NGOs encourage transnational membership through the practice of social entrepreneurship and financial literacy. OFWs who are excluded from mainstream economic institutions turn to their migrant communities as sites for establishing themselves as self-responsible and self-enterprising citizens linked to social obligations of building the Filipino nation. “We teach families of OFWs on how not to be dependent on remittances,” (Expert 3 interview) which means, paradoxically, migrant workers can exercise their right to return home. OFWs cannot afford to do so unless they have savings and investments. Expert 5 interview imparts, “going back home is not a choice for OFWs because they have no other means of living. OFWs must prepare for a ‘dignified return.’ Would-be returnees will not be able to survive with only 50 Euros in their wallet in this economic crisis, or I call war. OFWs must be able to earn, invest, save and create jobs.” Expert 5 shares that their NGO advocates migrants’ right to achieve development, wherein one is able to cultivate not only one’s character but also one’s social entrepreneurial activity. They teach OFWs on how to be strategic, resourceful, passionate and to utilize common sense in the creation of a social enterprise. “It is not something the books can teach you.” In addition, Expert 5 says they advocate migrants’ right to mobility, wherein people should migrate out of choice and not out of poverty.

There is a belief that OFWs are the ones to be blamed for their own circumstance, specifically, their exclusion. As Expert 3 recounts, “if they don’t start changing their behavior [of remitting without limit, not saving nor investing], they would remain as domestic helpers and they would forever be outside the Philippines;” reminding OFWs that “if your family wants your remittances to be permanent, it means only one thing: they don’t want you back home.”

Thus, the notion of citizenship is given a specific form through governing institutions. As Staeheli (2008) asserts, the attempts to promote “active citizenship” presume a model of community and citizenship wherein membership evolves out of place-based community. Rose (2000) highlights that the relationship between citizenship and communities can be manipulated through an exercise of power and politics, that is, to make communities responsible for citizens and vice versa. It is a specific kind of politics, called “ethopolitics” that “works through the values, beliefs, and sentiments thought to underpin the techniques of responsible self-government and the management of one’s obligations to others” (Rose 2000: 1399). Ultimately, citizenship lies on values of care and community instead of liberty and freedom (Staeheli 2008).

Overall, social entrepreneurship as a community-led development scheme wedds development practice and the pursuit of profit, upholding that development aspirations can be realized by merely extending the scope and scale of capitalism to the ten million men and wom-

en, and their families, who seek sustenance working abroad. It is a vision propelled by a mesh of civil society actors who are professed to “do good” and who reinforce “ethopolitics.” This scheme promotes a form of development that positions the economically marginalized individual and household rather than the state or the market as fundamentally responsible for bringing about (or not) development. Techniques of empowerment and risk management allow OFWs, households and communities to be mobilized for the intention of extracting community knowledge to bring about previously concealed practices visible, knowable, and thus governable. As Expert 3 expresses, “what we do is an attempt to influence the state in this advocacy.”

6. Modern-day Heroes’ Re-articulation of Citizenship

Transnationalism has been intensified through the practice of social entrepreneurship and financial literacy. Highlighting community, responsibility and active citizenship, this particular practice has increased OFWs’ effectiveness in capital accumulation strategies. NGOs, through their expertise and techniques, have laid out the migration for development framework onto the bodies of newly enterprising individuals. These techniques encourage OFWs to redefine a particular post-colonial cultural inscription, that is, self-sacrificing and self-regulating members of a migrant community linked to solidarity of a broader national polity. In other words, “empowered” OFWs reinforce the concept of modern-day national heroes of the Philippines.

Filipino heroism or nationalism has been symbolized by a life of suffering and sacrifice, modeling the courage of a significant historical, cultural and political figure, Jose Rizal, the first pronounced national hero of the Philippines (Guevarra 2003). Rizal devoted his life as an advocate of achieving Philippine independence from the Spanish colonizers through peaceful institutional reform. He died as a martyr fighting for the restoration of Filipino dignity.

The symbolic figure of the OFW bayani (hero) inhabits the collective imagination and intensifies the demands on individual migrants to make each migratory project a success (Basa, de Guzman, Marchetti 2012). This is evident in Tala’s case whose personal development and goals and visions of development are realigned with community development. Success is now often defined as fulfilling household responsibilities, providing better health and education, acquiring properties, securing finance and giving something back to the community.

Maya perceives herself as a “wonder woman” as she remits to her three children, parents and extended family twice a month for ten years, with only five percent left in her salary. Without any savings in the past, she was even borrowing money from her employer just to go back to the Philippines for a vacation. Aside from her familial responsibilities, she gives counseling sessions as an active member of a Filipino church organization in Rome.

“‘Modern-day heroes’ is a real concept because of our remittances,” Edna (OFW interview) believes. She also exudes Filipino heroism through assisting her sister to raise eleven children in the Philippines. However, not even one of them is able to finish studies. She expresses her deep regret regarding this situation when she recalls it took her seven years to take a vacation in the Philippines because she was extremely considering the expenses it would incur. She tells her nieces and nephews, “I have helped you build your future but you have never even appreciated my efforts. Anyway, you are the ones who create your own future.” Edna is a pensioner, who receives benefits from both the Philippines and Italy. She has never married but has raised one of her nieces like her own daughter. She has also assisted seven of her nieces to work in Italy. Edna has been in Rome for thirty-six years and has been a domestic helper for a sole employer since 1981. She says she is not able to leave the family (her employer), who has been generous and understanding to her.

Through financial planning, investing wisely and creating a social entrepreneurial activity, citizen-subjects establish their human capital and capacity to internalize techniques of empowerment and to act upon market logic (entrepreneurialism, risk management, financial security and personal responsibility) and development goals. Such practices demonstrate OFWs’ cultivating the right blend of competence and self-management.

6.1 Empowering oneself

“What would happen to me if I didn’t change my perspective,” Tessa considers. Tessa, along with other informants, claims that they have gained social awareness, especially in terms of selecting socially responsible investments. These investments must cater for the improvement of impoverished people’s lives, protection of the environment and empowerment of the marginalized to exercise their human rights. Maya has gone through the process of outlook change from self-demeaning to self-determining; from being a victim of poverty and end up doing domestic work to thinking of long-term goals while helping others. “I can’t give up now,” as her motto says. SE Program 1 has opened new doors for her. She enumerates, “I have had a balanced social life. Before, I would always feel bad to consume the money for

myself because that could be used to pay the bills in the Philippines. I have learned to manage my income, say 'no' to my children once in a while, separate my needs from wants, which help me to stop borrowing money. In terms of relationship with my family, I have shared with them my financial goals I have set and I have made sure there is division of work in the family, instead of just me working. I believe setting goals is lacking in every OFW."

Controlling remittance transfers is also an indication of an empowered OFW. Edna now thinks about the future of returning to the Philippines and so has made a decision not to transfer all her income. SE Program 1 "has helped me to invest in a condominium, divide my finances, and encourage myself to stop sending remittances to my kin once they finish their studies." OFWs have been learning to "break the cultural trend" of sending remittances to children and sometimes relatives even though they have their own families, in order to save for themselves, specifically for retirement.

Janice felt compelled to follow her parents and siblings to Rome. She left a career in the Philippines and ended de-skilled doing domestic work. Through SE Program 1, she claims she has regained her self-esteem and found her purpose in life. From then on, Janice always asks herself, "what can I do to develop myself, my family, and my community?" After SE Program 1, she has decided to become active in family counseling through a church organization. She claims she has found her passion. She has become zealous in constantly raising herself and in taking risks. "Filipinos are very talented and these must be put to good use," she believes. Janice hopes to pursue long-distance MA studies in a Philippine university for a year. She has realized she has become "dull" and inactive in Italy without any true friends.

These "bagong bayanis" or "modern-day heroes" conduct their behavior as "socially responsible, multi-skilled, entrepreneurial, and most of all, nationalistic" (Guevarra 2003: 20). If OFWs fail to re-style themselves as a more dynamic and better functioning community member, they suffer the blame for the lack of development in their household. As Edna observes and justifies, "We OFWs are the ones blamed for the luxurious life of dependents back home. I have been sending remittances because I want them to experience what good life means." Leni (left-behind daughter interview) shares that her household has become dependent on their mother's remittances. They have not finished university as there is constant financial support even though they have their own families. She emphasizes, "because our mother has been away, we have not gained much confidence, we are not competitive and we lack motivation. Our jobs are usually on a contractual project basis." Their household has come to a realization that "it's not forever that our mother is there to support us. So we've started to think of setting up a business even though we didn't finish university and until our mother can support us with the capital."

6.2 Capitalizing on strategic skills

All my informants have started to save and invest since they realized that their work overseas has its time limit and there is still no available job for them in the sending country. They, together with their households, have considered entrepreneurial plans which are rooted from their passions. It is exemplified by Eva and her daughter, Kay who have been transnationally planning on setting-up an event organizing service, which they intend to operate in the Philippines. However, they are still open to other interests and are willing to study more about them.

Likewise, Janice has started to look for alternatives since now earning is not her main objective. She has learned to live simply, reward herself once in a while, not live a life she cannot afford and not incur debts. In fact, she keeps a mission board on the wall of her bedroom for inspiration each day.

“Dream big, start small,” is Maya’s guiding principle. Her goal is to put up a tailor shop when she returns to the Philippines, which can serve as her children’s source of income. Guided by this vision, she has stopped sending remittances to her extended family for their electricity bills. Maya has also taken some time to budget her money and accordingly tells her children how much is allotted for what. As a result, she is now financially free. She has been to the Philippines three times without borrowing any money and overspending.

In the case of Tala and Tessa, they capitalize on their self-knowledge and desires to be able to work better and give something back to the community. Both earn extra income through selling condominiums (located in Manila) to fellow OFWs. Their being strategic, able to persevere and face challenges are utilized in their quest to mobilize capital.

Active citizenship coupled with cultural norms and values become apparent in the ways citizenship is understood and constructed by political subjects within community spaces. Both two cases below – socially investing and founding a social enterprise – highly illustrate the ways in which this particular understanding of citizenship becomes a standard of political subjectivity against which all other citizens are measured. The first example takes place transnationally and the second one in Rome.

Transnational Social Investors

A pensioner for eight years now, Ruben reveals he is now on the phase of capital-building, which is directly correlated with the dream map he drew during the SE Program 1. He and

his wife have lived in Rome since 1986. They both do domestic work. They have raised one daughter who is now in second year university in Italy. The couple still sends a part of their remittances to assist their niece's tuition fees. Ruben receives two pensions, one from Italy and one from the Philippines. He recommends, "the higher amount and the longer years you pay, the more pension you get." He always attends SE Program 1 even though he already finished one program. He says, "I am always curious and challenged what [SE Program 1] offers. I always ask myself why Chinese become rich. Filipinos are still impoverished even though their salary is high!" Through SE Program 1, he has found the answer and become part of an investment group with Edna and two more participants. They gather a pool of funds which they invest in a microfinance and gain 7.5% per annum. They have earned 300 to 383.91 Euros in two years' time. Ruben believes it is a social investment since they share a part of their capital to local farmers in Mindanao (the second largest and southernmost island in the Philippines). "I tried investing in 1985 but unfortunately it failed. Investment needs time and time is a sacrifice. What I do for the investment group is free labor, a voluntary work. I find it difficult to convince other members to work more. If we devote more time and money, we earn more. Filipinos have still so much to learn in investing: first, we need to develop a cooperative mind and not 'how much can I earn from a cooperative? is it secure?;' second, we need to know how to work together to fight the rich and not spend our money on fiestas – that is what we are good at; third, we have to share what we learn, for example, 'if you see your neighbor eating dried fish while you are eating meat, what would you do? You can't let them eat something like that if you know that you can help them.' Other Filipinos are scared to take risks. Their mentality is to help only the family. They only know how to borrow money but don't know how to pay back. The good thing about social entrepreneurship is the essence of community wherein everyone is on equal footing in terms of distribution of wealth. Everyone has the right to resources and mobilize capital."

Aside from "not putting your egg in one basket," Ruben has learned some strategic skills in capital-building. He enumerates, "first, always study. Learn both theory and practice and implement it. Second, ask resource people. Third, learn from others and test it. Fourth, be patient, investment takes time. Fifth, be frugal, which means stay away from luxury. Sixth, make sure your investment is godly. Do not be greedy because you cannot take your investment to the grave. Lastly, discipline." If he could only make reforms in the education system, he said he would want financial literacy be taught to young kids instead of language learning, for example. Ruben is very keen on continuous learning. He advocates OFWs must change their mindset, which is antagonistic to investment. "Let's all get into investment," as his motto says. Ruben's next target is exchange trading fund and focus on the "social" aspect of an investment.

'AKIT' Magazine: A Social Enterprise in Rome

AKIT stands for Ako, Ikaw, Tayo Tungo sa Pagbabago or Me, You, Us Towards Change. Since its first issue released in 2010, AKIT Magazine has been dubbed the most visible social entrepreneurship endeavor in terms of social impact. As one of the editors of the magazine, Janice says that OFWs in Italy could relate to the published stories. It is something different. Janice herself notes that the magazine intends to showcase the concept of modern-day national heroes in written form. The editors and contributors voluntarily devote their free time. Part of AKIT's mission is to level-up the status quo of Filipinos who are stuck in domestic work and to unite OFWs in Rome. As Ling (OFW and co-editor of AKIT interview) imparts, "I want to be an inspiration to others." AKIT is an avenue for the contributors to prove to themselves and others that they are able to harness their potential, especially their talent in writing.

Janice says AKIT is an alternative project for her personality development. Her yearning to pay it forward and to share profit with others is fulfilled by this social entrepreneurship project. Working in this activity, Janice has utilized her resourcefulness, eco-friendly consciousness and not immediately wanting for big returns. She believes her role in AKIT is an example of "servant leadership: a model of good work, teamwork, responsibility and service to people accomplished by giving tasks to everyone according to their strengths, because each is valuable and appreciate them."

7. Concluding thoughts

The overall aim of this paper was to tease out an understanding of citizenship articulated by transnational political agents and the ways in which it becomes an indicator of political subjectivity, and at the same time challenge some taken for granted aspects of cross-border migration and development. The intention of this critique has not been to discredit the transformative promise of participatory collective action. Instead, it has been to put into question some of the ways transnational strategies and practices and the concept of social entrepreneurship have been grasped without considering the broader processes they are embedded in and their implications for citizenship.

My contribution has been to delve into the dangers associated with romanticizing social entrepreneurial activities and "change-makers" as emblematic of community-led development scheme, which resonates with neoliberal ideologies. The approach shifts the attention away

from the role of the state as the major labor exporter to the role of OFWs and their households who represent a lack of development and at the same time assumed to catalyze local development. While the social entrepreneurship approach offers new avenues for income generation for some “poor” households, the practices through which households are “converted” into “empowered” social entrepreneurial subjects can stimulate novel forms of discipline and control, especially in excluding those who cannot manage risks.

Furthermore, the preceding analysis on Philippine citizenship contributes to the critical literature on citizenship exposing the boundaries of a notion of citizenship as an established set of stabilized rights and obligations. With the assemblage of citizenship regime, NGOs wield implicit power over transitional migrant populations at a particular political scale. This confluence engenders the formation of various techniques for differentiated governing, thereby affecting notions of citizenship and ideas of belonging. Today, OFWs seek to make sense of their circumstances and struggles and develop strategies as political agents in relation to a broader community. They maneuver to changing conditions, institutions and opportunity structures across borders and scales. In constructing a substantive form of citizenship in contemporary governance, OFWs identify and devise an extensive set of institutions, agents, allegiances and practices in terms of keeping their jobs, making ends meet, sustaining transnational linkages and building allegiances. In this process, the space a community offers plays a pivotal role.

References

- Basa, C., de Guzman, V., Marchetti, S. (2012) 'International migration and over-indebtedness: the case of Filipino workers in Italy.' *IIED Human Settlements Working Paper* 36. UK.
- Basa, C., Harcourt, W. and Zarro, A. (2011) 'Remittances and transnational families in Italy and The Philippines: breaking the global care chain.' *Gender and Development* 19 (1): 11-22.
- Caglar, A. (2006) 'Hometown associations, the rescaling of state spatiality and migrant grassroots transnationalism.' *Global Networks* 6 (1): 1-22.
- Cook, B., Dodds, C. and Mitchell, W. (2003) 'Social entrepreneurship: False premises and dangerous forebodings.' *Australian Journal of Social Issues* 38: 57-71.
- Dean, M. (2010) *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society* Second Edition. London: Sage.
- Dean, M. (1999) *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.
- Dean, M. (1995) 'Governing the Unemployed Self in an Active Society,' *Economy and Society* 24(4): 559-83.
- Dey, P. (2010) 'The Symbolic Violence of 'Social Entrepreneurship': Language, Power and the Question of the Social (Subject).' The Third Research Colloquium on Social Entrepreneurship – Saïd Business School, University of Oxford, 22nd-25th June, 2010.
- Faist, T. (2010) *The Migration Development Nexus: A Transnational View on Changing Paradigms*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. Co-edited with Fauser, M. and Kivisto, P.
- Faist, T. (2008) 'Migrants as Transnational Development Agents: An Inquiry into the Newest Round of the Migration-Development Nexus.' *Population, Space and Place* 14(1): 21-42.
- Farmer, J., Hill, C. and Muñoz, S. (2012) *Community Co-Production: Social enterprise in remote and rural areas*. Northampton MA: Edward Elgar.
- Giddens, A. (1998) *The Third Way. The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity.

Guevarra, A. (2003) 'Governing migrant workers through empowerment and sustaining a culture of labor migration: the case of the Philippines.' Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Atlanta Hilton Hotel, Atlanta, GA, August 16.

Hart, K., Laville, J. and Cattani, A. (2010) 'Building the Human Economy Together.' In *The Human Economy*. UK: Polity Press. pp. 1-17.

Herbert-Cheshire, L. and Higgins, V. (2004) 'From risky to responsible: expert knowledge and the governing of community-led rural development.' *Journal of Rural Studies* 20: 289-302.

Hulgard, L. (2010) 'Social Entrepreneurship.' In: Hart, K., Laville, J. and Cattani, A (ed.) *The Human Economy*. UK: Polity Press. pp. 293-300.

Leitner, H. and Ehrkamp, P. (2006) 'Rethinking Immigration and Citizenship: New Spaces of Migrant Transnationalism and Belonging.' *Environment and Planning A* 38(9): 1591-1597.

Levitt, P. and Glick Schiller, N. (2004) 'Transnational Perspectives on Migration: Conceptualizing Simultaneity.' *International Migration Review* 38 (3): 1002-1039.

Li, T. (2006) 'Neo-Liberal Strategies of Government through Community: The Social Development Program of the World Bank in Indonesia.' Working Paper 2 Institute for International Law and Justice New York University School of Law.

Lindley, A. (2009) 'The Early Morning Phonecall: Remittances from a Refugee Diaspora Perspective.' *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies* 35 (8): 1315-1334.

McWilliams, A, Siegel, D. and Wright, P. (2006) 'Corporate Social Responsibility: Strategic Implications.' *Journal of Management Studies* 43 (1): 1-18.

Miller, P. and Rose, N. (2008) *Governing the Present*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Page, A. and Katz, R. (2011) 'Is Social Enterprise the New Corporate Social Responsibility?' *Seattle University Law Review* 34: 1351-1384.

Peredo, A. (2009) 'Social Entrepreneurship.' In: Dana, L.P. *International encyclopedia of entrepreneurship* edited by. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Raghuram, P. (2007) 'Which Migration, What Development: Unsettling the Edifice of Migration and Development.' *Center on Migration, Citizenship and Development Working Paper* 28. Bielefeld: University of Bielefeld.

- Rose, N. (1999) *Powers of Freedom: Reframing political thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, N. (1998) *Inventing Our Selves: Psychology, Power and Personhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, N. (1996) 'The death of the social? Refiguring the territory of government.' *Economy and Society* 25 (3): 327-356.
- Rose, N. (2000) 'Community, citizenship, and the third way.' *American Behavioral Scientist* 43 (9): 1395-1411.
- Solomon, M. (2009) 'State-led Migration, Democratic Legitimacy, and Deterritorialization: The Philippines' labour export model.' *European Journal of East Asian Studies* 8(2): 275-300.
- Staeheli, L. (2008) 'Citizenship and the problem of community.' *Political Geography* 27: 5-21.
- Swyngedouw, E. (2005) 'Let the people govern? Civil society, governmentality, and governance beyond the state.' *Urban Studies* (special issue SINGOCOM).
- Taylor, M. (2003) *Public Policy in the Community*. Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Weekley, K. (2003) 'Saving Pennies for the State: A New Role for Filipino Migrant Workers?' *The South East Asia Research Centre Working Paper* 57.